

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,229	11/19/2001	Philippe Bernadat	10012452-1	6889

7590 08/25/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,229

Applicant(s)

BERNADAT ET AL.

Examiner

Kuo-Liang J Tang

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) * | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/7/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 11/19/2001.

The priority date for this application is 11/19/2001.

Claims 1-15 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Beadle et al., US Patent No. 6,637,025 (hereinafter Beadle).

As Per Claim 1, Beadle teaches provides a process in a data processing system for executing bytecodes. The bytecodes are contained in a JAVA archive file along with just in time compiling instructions. (E.g. see Abstract and associated text). In that Beadle discloses a computer-implemented method for extending functionality of a first set of classes and methods in an application hosted by a computing arrangement, comprising:

“establishing a mapping of original class names of classes in the first set (E.g see col. 5:64- col. 6:35, e.g. loading of a class) to corresponding substitute class names of classes in a second set (E.g see col. 5:64- col. 6:35, e.g. loading of new classes), wherein the classes in the

Art Unit: 2122

second set change the functionality of the classes in the first set (E.g see col. 5:64- col. 6:35, e.g. “special instructions for not JIT'ing certain classes or methods”);” The mapping is inherent because the new class is an extension of the old class otherwise the classloader can not load the new class without error occurs.

“in response to loading a class file of a class in the first set, replacing in the class file original class names with corresponding substitute class names (E.g see col. 5:64- col. 6:35, e.g. “loading of new classes”),”; and

“instantiating classes referenced by the substitute class names in lieu of classes referenced by the original class names (E.g see col. 6:2, e.g. initialized)”.

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

“establishing a mapping of original method names of the first set to corresponding substitute method names of methods in a second set, wherein the methods in the second set change the functionality of the methods in the first set; in response to loading a class file of a class in the first set, replacing in the class file original methods names with corresponding substitute method names; and invoking methods referenced by the substitute method names in lieu of methods referenced by the original method names” (Again, see as noted above of Claim 1).

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

“caching (E.g. see col. 3:36, cache memory) on the computing system the class file having the substitute class names and substitute method names”.

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

“replacing the original class names with the substitute class names in a constant pool within the class file, and changing in the class file method invocation bytecodes (E.g see col. 6:14-17) from references to original methods to references to substitute methods”.

As Per claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

“wherein the classes in the first set are selected ones of standard Java API classes, and the classes in the second set change the functionality of the selected ones of the standard Java API classes” (E.g see col. 5:64- col. 6:35, where the new class is an extension of the original Java class, therefore, it’s a Java class also).

As Per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

“wherein the selected ones of the standard Java API classes include selected input and output Java API classes”. (E.g. see FIG. 3, “FCCF File” 306 and FLAT FILE” 308 and associated text, e.g. col. 6:59 – col. 7:16).

As Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Beadle teaches:

Art Unit: 2122

“caching (E.g. see col. 3:36, cache memory) on the computing system the class file having the substitute class names and substitute method names (E.g. see FIG. 2, CLASS LOADER 202 and associated text).

As Per Claim 8, is the apparatus claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per Claim 9, is the application program claim corresponding to the method claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As per Claims 10-15, the rejection of claim 9 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2-7 respectfully.

Art Unit: 2122

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is 703-305-4866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

Anthony Nguyen Ba

ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER